

Appl. No. : 09/935,789  
Filed : August 22, 2001

## REMARKS

In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

### Discussion of Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner made certain objections to Claims 1 and 3-20. In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Claim 8 is objected as being of improper dependent form. In response, Applicant has cancelled Claim 8.

Furthermore, in the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 1 and 3-20 stating that the terms “at least” before “partly” was indefinite. In the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledged that “one of ordinary skill in the art” can fairly interpret the term ‘partly’ or ‘in part’ and therefore the Examiner has substitution of this terminology.” Applicant notes that the phrase “partly Pareto” includes Pareto-like behavior and true Pareto behavior. Applicant has corrected Claims 1, 11, 13, and 14, as suggested by the Examiner. Furthermore, Applicant has cancelled “at least” with respect to Claim 12.

With respect to the phrase “in part” in Claims 3, 12, 16, and 20, Applicant respectfully submits that the language is not indefinite. For example Claim 3 recites: “designing the essentially digital system based at least in part upon the task concurrency optimized grey-box system-level description.” Applicant respectfully submits that with respect to Claim 3, the designing act is based at least in part upon the task concurrent optimized grey-box system-level description. It is to be appreciated that the foregoing language clarifies that the designing act may also be based on other types of information.

### Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 8, 12, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated that “[t]he functional relation between the ‘non-deterministic behavior’ claim limitation and the remaining claim limitations is unclear. Applicant notes that the respective limitations recite “non-

**Appl. No.** : **09/935,789**  
**Filed** : **August 22, 2001**

deterministic behavior of the digital system is modeled by interacting the tasks, while each of the tasks describe part of the deterministic behavior of the digital system.” Thus, the non-deterministic behavior is modeled by interacting tasks. Applicant respectfully submits that the relationship of the elements is sufficiently clear and respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

**Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 3-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Prayati, et al., titled “Task Concurrency Management Experiment for Power-efficient Speed-up of Embedded MPEG4 IM1 Player.” Applicant has enclosed herewith a Declaration Under 35 U.S.C. § 1.131 and M.P.E.P. 715.01(c) showing that the Prayati paper is a publication of Applicant’s own invention. In view of this, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

**Conclusion**

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner’s concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims for patentability purposes, the reasons therefore, and arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. Any claim amendments which are not specifically discussed in the above remarks are not made for patentability purposes, and the claims would satisfy the statutory requirements for patentability without the entry of such amendments. In addition, such amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims. Rather, these amendments have only been made to increase claim readability, to improve grammar, and to reduce the time and effort required of those in the art to clearly understand the scope of the claim language. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is

Appl. No. : 09/935,789  
Filed : August 22, 2001

specifically requested. If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 4/3/2006

By:   
Eric M. Nelson  
Registration No. 43,829  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(619) 235-8550

2316251:sad2  
040306